

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 409 765

HE 030 239

AUTHOR Murphy, Patricia D.; Gerst, Jeffrey
TITLE Assessment of Student Learning in Graduate Programs.
PUB DATE 8 May 96
NOTE 6p.; Paper presented at the Annual Forum of the Association of Institutional Research (Albuquerque, NM, May 8, 1996).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Faculty; Doctoral Programs; *Educational Improvement; Evaluation Methods; Graduate Students; *Graduate Study; Higher Education; Masters Programs; Outcomes of Education; *Student Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS *North Dakota State University; *Primary Trait Scoring

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses the lack of effective assessment of student learning in graduate programs and presents the results of a case study designed to improve the assessment of graduate student learning at North Dakota State University (NDSU). Graduate faculty in several departments at NDSU decided to adapt Primary Traits Analysis (PTA) to graduate tasks in their master's and doctoral programs. PTA involves identifying the essential characteristics of successfully completed tasks or projects. Faculty began by specifying three to six student outcomes for each graduate program at each degree level. Departments then developed check sheets for use by faculty in assessing student performance on traits identified for the task. The faculty involved have concluded that PTA can be adapted for use by graduate faculty and that evidence for student assessment can be gathered that goes beyond "pass" and is useful in improvement efforts. (Contains 13 references.) (MDM)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

Patricia D. Murphy, Ph.D.
Jeffery Gerst, Ph.D.
North Dakota State University

Assessment of Student Learning in Graduate Programs

Grades of at least "B," "pass" on comprehensive exams, and "satisfactory" on the thesis or dissertation are traditional hallmarks of graduate education. The students who receive a graduate degree have successfully "passed" all the tasks in the program.

A review of the literature indicates little has been presented at professional meetings or published about the assessment of learning by graduate students. In their review, Kaylor and Johnson (1994) observed that graduate and professional education are seldom addressed in discussions of outcomes assessment. Examination of assessment plans and reports reveals some disturbing tales about what is going on.

The following statement is from the assessment plan of a prestigious midwestern university which shall remain unnamed, "The goal of assessment of graduate student learning in 1994 was to evaluate the services and staff of the graduate office. Students were asked to respond to a ten-item questionnaire in which a rating was given to such matters as the courtesy, promptness, and knowledge of the staff, and the quality and usefulness of printed materials." Another example, "The knowledge and skills of graduate students are assessed continuously and include standards of admission, retention, and graduation . . ." What does this tell you about the academic achievement of students in the program when the emphasis is on IMPROVING student learning?

When the goal of assessment is to improve student learning, data that students successfully completed the requirements (thesis, oral seminar, defense, etc.) do not provide evidence to identify areas of program strength or areas where the program and

Paper presented at the Association of Institutional Research Annual Forum,
Albuquerque, NM, May 8, 1996.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this doc-
ument do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Patricia D. Murphy

Jeffrey Gerst

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

learning could be improved. Faculty in graduate programs agree that they "know it when they see it," and use their expertise and experience to judge appropriate graduate level performance. There is little attention paid to student outcomes (Conrad & Egan, 1990).

Efforts to assist graduate faculty in re-examining their practices in graduate education have met with only modest success. Getting beyond the notion that since the student successfully completed all the requirements for the degree "the learning is assured," to gathering data relative to what was actually learned is progressing slowly. While alumni surveys, exit interviews of student satisfaction with the program, and other indirect measures provide useful information, they do not provide the direct evidence of what was learned and what was not learned so well. Graduate faculty, assessment directors, and AIR professionals with assessment responsibilities are searching for ways to use the activities of graduate programs for more direct assessment of learning.

When graduate faculty are approached with the question, "Do all graduate students do **equally well** on all aspects of the graduate program?" their response is, "**No.**" Thus the intent is to find ways acceptable to graduate faculty to gather such evidence. One computer science professor described it this way, "How do we know whether the students are actually learning what we want them to learn?"

The traditional judgment about students' progress by the professor is not what this is about. Professors will continue to use various means, such as projects, papers, examinations, and the like, to "grade" students' progress through the program. Grades in courses, for example, do not provide the answers. The assumption is made that students who get A's have learned more than students who get C's but there is no evidence of precisely what either group learned well or less well. Whatever the assessment method used, it must give the department the ability to diagnose program/student strengths and weaknesses so that constructive improvement measures can be devised where needed. Every method used should provide evidence of outcome attainment including specific areas of effective or ineffective performance. Evidence is

needed of learning in relation to the outcomes; evidence of achievement **across** students to improve programs and learning.

A case study reporting the results of faculty efforts at North Dakota State University (NDSU) to use the traditional activities of graduate programs is reported. Briefly, NDSU has about 9500 students. There are about 550 graduate students enrolled in 40 master's programs and 18 Ph.D. programs.

The Method

Graduate faculty in several departments at NDSU decided to adapt Primary Traits Scoring analysis to graduate tasks in their master's and doctoral programs.

Primary Traits Analysis comes originally from the scoring of written papers by English teachers. (A list of references on the technique and its uses is provided.) The technique was first used on a large scale by the National Assessment of Educational Progress in 1974. The purpose was to provide information about what students know and can do.

Primary Traits Analysis involves identifying the essential characteristics of a successfully completed task or product. What traits or characteristics are inherent in the task or product? It involves the faculty making explicit the things they look for in the comprehensive exam responses, the research proposal, the oral seminar presentation, the thesis, or the oral defense. The criteria being used are explicitly stated. For example, what constitutes a thesis that "passes"? Traits are the things the faculty care about.

Faculty began by specifying three to six student learning outcomes for each graduate program at each degree level. Faculty recognized that the Graduate School's forms for program completion were too global to be useful in providing evidence of attainment of the outcomes. They wanted to retain the traditional activities of graduate programs, only make them more useful for improvement.

Primary traits analysis was already being tried in some undergraduate programs so they decided to try it with graduate program activities. The faculty had already agreed they "knew it when they saw it" so they began by identifying the important characteristics, or traits, of successfully completed tasks, such as the review of literature, the oral seminar, the thesis or dissertation, and the final oral defense.

Results

The departments have developed check sheets for use by faculty in assessing student performance on the traits identified for the task. Usually a three-level rating scale is used. Student performance is then rated on the various tasks. It takes very little additional time of the faculty. The Graduate School receives the "pass" or "satisfactory" it requires. The department accumulates the data across students to identify areas of strength and areas where learning may need improvement, although each individual student may have performed well enough to "pass."

The Zoology faculty have identified a further concern from their use of primary traits analysis on the final oral defense.

Conclusion

The faculty's purpose was to find a feasible way to use the usual tasks in graduate programs to gather evidence of student learning in order to improve that learning. They have concluded that Primary Traits Analysis can be adapted for use by graduate faculty. Evidence can be gathered that goes beyond "pass" and is useful in improvement efforts. A concern remains with the problems of having only a small number of program completers in some master's and doctoral programs.

Selected References

- Conrad, C. F., & Egan, D. J. (1990). Master's degree programs in higher education. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), Higher education handbook of theory and research Vol. 1, (pp. 106-160). New York: Agathon Press.
- Delaney, A. M. (1995, May). Quality assessment of professional master's degree programs. Paper presented at the 35th Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research, Boston.

- Fuller, D. A. (1987, January). Evaluation and curriculum: A case study in primary trait scoring. Unpublished paper. Indianapolis, IN: Metropolitan School District. ED 285 153.
- Kaylor, C. E., Jr. & Johnson, J. P. (1994, May). Institutional effects in graduate professional education: Bridging the gap. Paper presented at the 34th Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research, New Orleans.
- Krupa, G. H. (1979). Primary trait scoring in the classroom. College Composition and Communication, 30(2), 214-215.
- Lloyd-Jones, R. (1977). Primary trait scoring. In C. Cooper & L. Odell (Eds.), Evaluating writing: Describing, measuring, judging (pp.-33-36). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Meyers, G. D. (1988). Efficient, effective evaluation: Grading business communication assignments with the primary trait scoring method. Bulletin of the Association for Business Communication, 51(2), 18-21.
- Meyers, G. D. (1989). Grading writing assignments using primary-trait scoring. Technical Communications, 36(1), 78-79.
- Mullis, I. V. S. (1976). The primary trait system for scoring writing tasks. National Assessment of Educational Progress. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.
- Sharkey, S., & Johnson, W. S. (1992). Assessing undergraduate learning in sociology. Washington, DC: ASA Teaching Resources Center.
- Walvoord, B. E. (1995, June). Using traditional classroom grading for modern assessment needs. Workshop presented at the AAHE Conference on Assessment & Quality, Boston, MA.
- Walvoord, B. E., Anderson, V. D., Breihan, J. R., McCarthy, L. P., Robison, S. M., & Sherman, A. K. (1996). Making traditional graded tests and assignments serve contemporary needs for assessment. In T. W. Banta, J. P. Lund, K. E., Black, & F. W. Oblander. Assessment in practice: Putting principles to work on college campuses. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Walvoord, B. E., & McCarthy, L. P. (1990). Thinking and writing in college: A naturalistic study of students in four disciplines. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER
(ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION

Title: Assessment of Student Learning
Graduate Programs
in
Author(s): Murphy & Gerst
Date: May 1996

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, or electronic/optical media, and are sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) or other ERIC vendors. Credit is given to the source of each document. If reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

Detach and complete this form and submit with your document. This form may be copied as needed.

<p style="text-align: center;">"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Patricia Murphy</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Jeff Gerst</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFOR- MATION CENTER (ERIC)"</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY</p> <p style="text-align: center;">_____</p> <p style="text-align: center;">TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFOR- MATION CENTER (ERIC)"</p>
---	---

If permission is granted to reproduce the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the options below and sign the release on the other side.

- | | | |
|--|----|--|
| <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Permitting
microfiche
(4" x 6" film)
paper copy,
electronic, and
optical media
reproduction (Level 1)</p> | OR | <p><input type="checkbox"/> Permitting
reproduction in
other than paper
copy (Level 2)</p> |
|--|----|--|

Documents will be processed as indicated, provided quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but neither box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

OVER

Signature Required

"I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce this document as indicated on the other side. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic/optical media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries."

Signature: Patricia D. Murphy

Printed Name: Patricia Murphy

Organization: North Dakota State University

Position: Dean

Address: Fargo, ND 58105-5075

Tel. No: 701 231 8262 Zip Code: _____

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION

(Non-ERIC Source)

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents which cannot be made available through EDRS).

Publisher/Distributor: _____

Address: _____

Price Per Copy: _____

Quantity Price: _____

IV. REFERRAL TO COPYRIGHT/ REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER

If the right to grant reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

